

THE AMERICAN

A NATIONAL JOURNAL

VOL. XXVIII—No. 721

PHILADELPHIA, SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1898

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE AMERICAN.

A NATIONAL JOURNAL.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY ON EACH SATURDAY.

[Entered at the Post Office at Philadelphia as matter of the second class.]

BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY, PROPRIETORS.
WHARTON BARKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES,
Rooms 24 and 26
Forrest Building, No. 119 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISING.

Subscription, \$2.00 per annum. Subscribers must notify us when they wish to discontinue.

Advertising rates for short or long time furnished on application.

Specimen copies sent on application.

A copy will be sent free to each advertiser during the continuance of his advertisement.

CHECKS, POSTAL ORDERS, ETC., should be drawn to order of BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY.

*Address through Post Office: THE AMERICAN, Box 1202, Philadelphia.

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE.

	PAGE
Notes of the Week	337
EDITORIALS:	
Coming Populist Conferences at Omaha	341
"Co-operate and Conquer"—A Reply to Senator Butler	342
Gladstone; A Study	345
No Anglo-American Alliance	347
PEOPLES PARTY DOINGS	348
Illinois Populists Down Fusion	348
Alabama Populists Full of Hope	349
Chairman Butler's Victory in North Carolina	349
BOOK REVIEWS:	350
Publications Received	352

CARDINAL TENETS OF THE PEOPLES PARTY.

Creation and Maintenance of an Honest Measure of Values.
Free Coinage of Gold and Silver.
Government Ownership and Operation of Railroad, Telegraph and Telephone Lines.
Opposition to Trusts.
Opposition to Alien Ownership of Land and Court-made Law.
Recognition of the Right of the People to Rule, *i. e.*, The Initiative and Referendum.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

AT THIS writing Admiral Cervera's squadron is officially reported located, entrapped, but not as yet destroyed. It seems that the Spanish Admiral has fallen into a trap of his own making. Into the harbor of Santiago, on the southeast coast of Cuba, he deliberately took his fleet; in that harbor he has been entrapped by the American squadrons, and Commodore Schley left before the mouth of the harbor, with a superior fleet, to keep him bottled up. And thus bottled up he can render no

direct assistance to General Blanco. From the port of Santiago, surrounded by insurgents and without any rail communication with Havana, he can get no supplies to General Blanco, not a pound of powder, not a single shell.

In short, if his mission was to put a large stock of munitions of war into the hands of General Blanco, he has failed utterly. If his mission was to break the blockade of Cuba he has failed. He has simply forced the blockading of one more Cuban harbor with himself bottled up within it. So, always providing that he does not find some means of escape from the harbor in which he is entrapped, all that his presence in Cuban waters can avail General Blanco is a weakening of the American fleet for offensive operations against Spanish-Cuban forts, by necessitating the keeping of a powerful American blockade squadron before Santiago that, if he were not there, might be otherwise engaged. And this will not retard the movement of United States troops to Cuba, will not seriously diminish the effectiveness of the fleet co-operating with the army, for a fleet, amply strong enough for all practical purposes is available for this service.

BUT by keeping up the game of hide and seek Admiral Cervera could have hoped to accomplish little more than this. He might by such game have diverted the American squadrons from knocking down Spanish forts in Cuba, he could not have prevented, by manœuvring in the Caribbean Sea and on the south side of Cuba, where he was hemmed in by the American fleets, the landing of United States troops on the north coast.

It may be that the hope was nourished in Spain that the manœuvring of the Spanish fleet would draw the American fighting fleets away on a false scent and thus open the way for Admiral Cervera to strike the blockading squadrons at Cienfuegos or even Havana with overwhelming force, while the American battleships were too far distant to render them aid, and thus put into General Blanco's hands needed supplies which it is said the Spanish squadron carried for him. If this was the hope it was vain.

Again, it may have been the hope of Admiral Cervera that by his hiding and running game he could draw out the line of American ships in pursuit, thus separate the faster cruisers from the battleships and then turning, deliver crushing blows to his pursuers, destroy them and be in flight again before the battleships could come up to their assistance. But the chance of success in this way was even slimmer than his chance of reinforcing General Blanco with munitions of war.

Finally, it may be that he came to American waters with the certainty of entailing much risk and with little hope of any success; not with the expectation that he could defend Cuba, but in response to a demand of the Spanish people too strong to be ignored. Heavy taxes, combined with dear bread, have put the Spanish people in the humor of revolution, and the Spanish government resting around a tottering throne, holding office at the hands of a hated Queen Regent of foreign blood, has not a free hand either to conduct the war or make peace.

ADMIRAL Sampson and his aids were subjected to much impatient criticism because Admiral Cervera evaded them as long as he did. No fault should have been found if Admiral Cervera had evaded being entrapped yet a while. If he had not chosen to entrap himself, to choose the trap in which he would be caught, a trap in which he could make a better defense than if caught in a trap on the high seas and of his adversaries' choosing, the chances are that he would yet be untrapped. If Admiral Sampson had succeeded in forcing him into battle, great credit, unstinted praise would have been his due. And that that praise would have been unbounded, that credit promptly given if, having located the Spanish squadron, he had caught and destroyed it, no one need doubt. But if Admiral Cervera had not slipped into the trap laid for him, or into the trap of his own choosing, and had again lost himself to the world on the broad bosom of the Caribbean, despite the activity of the American naval scouts, unreasoning criticism, it is much to be feared, would have been turned out in volume, criticism that would have turned to praise if a few days later Sampson laid a second trap and caught the wily Spaniard. Such is human nature, it is success not effort that brings laudation and laurels though the effort that is fruitless may be greater, better conceived, more deserving of success than the effort that succeeds, succeeds, perchance, not so much from one's own effort as one's competitors' dull wittedness or blunders.

ON the broad main it is always easier for a ship to keep away from than to find an adversary. Instance the Confederate cruiser Alabama during our Civil War which kept out of the reach of many Federal cruisers for two long years. True, with coal considered semi-contraband of war this can never occur again while ships are dependent on coal and steam, for no cruiser never going near a home port, could get the coal to keep on the high seas. And it is this question of coal that counted against Admiral Cervera. The task of hiding a squadron is much easier than searching, the task of keeping away easier than catching, so that the advantage in a hide and seek game must lie with the hiding squadron even when the opposing squadrons are of equal speed. When the speed of the hiding squadron is materially greater its advantage is many fold greater. And this advantage Admiral Cervera had, for in this game the fighting advantage of the American squadrons was of no avail.

But without plenty of coal Admiral Cervera's running advantage disappears. And coal was a scarce article with him. To get coal he could not avoid turning up every little while at some port for coaling or at some sheltered spot where he could re-coal from ships sent to him with coal. But he could not fill his bunkers when he turned up at a neutral port. He was only permitted to take enough coal to carry him to the nearest friendly port. And once having coaled in this unsatisfactory manner at one of the West Indian islands of a neutral power he could not look further to the coal depots on the islands of that power for further supplies. Thus he was reported to have taken coal first at a French, then a Dutch island. From getting further supplies from French or Dutch islands he was therefore estopped. He might have gotten a little coal at some other islands but it must have been clear to him that, dependent on coal that he might get from neutral powers, he would soon become helpless for want of fuel.

Dependence he therefore could only place in coal transports. But France established the precedent at Martinique of refusing to permit the transfer of coal from a collier to a belligerent man-of-war within her jurisdiction. So the Spanish were cut down to recoaling on the high seas, a most risky operation, or to recoaling surreptitiously in some sheltered but out of the way harbor, an operation even more risky in another way, as it would be imposing on a neutral nation.

What is more, such colliers were liable to capture, even though neutral vessels, as carrying contraband of war, and the

necessity of meeting them at appointed places must have destroyed the independence of movement on the part of the Spanish fleet, while, at the same time, there was the danger that such colliers might be tracked, and thus become guides as to the whereabouts of the Spaniards. So, because of this coaling question, Admiral Cervera's difficulties must have so multiplied as to make it clear to him that the successful playing of the hiding and running game would soon become impossible. To Santiago he may have been driven in very desperation.

THE military and naval sides of war are not the only ones. They are the spectacular and as such rivet the attention. But there are material sides that are of much greater concern to our people than many of the military and naval moves of which much is made. And these material sides are the drains that war makes upon our people, drains that can be made comparatively light or grievously burdensome according to the way they are distributed. If they are fairly and justly distributed they can be easily borne; if they are not they will rest heavily and be a great weight upon the country, weakening it immeasurably for the conduct of the war. And it is Congress that is called upon to decide how these burdens shall be distributed. It is now in the midst of this work, a work that concerns the interests of all men, a work that may result in undermining the profits of all industrial and mercantile undertakings, a work that may be done so that the profits of industry will grow and the country enjoy prosperity in spite of the drain of war and the taxes necessitated by war.

Yet the interest taken by the public in the doings of Congress is almost down to zero. The moneyed interests are making their influence felt, they are raising their voice against the imposition of taxes on accumulated wealth or the earnings thereof, they are insisting that all the taxes should rest on articles of general consumption, that if men's earnings are to be directly taxed such taxes should be on brain and muscle, that the earnings of the industrious should be taxed, not the incomes of the idle rich. And meanwhile the voice of those who work with brain and muscle, of those who consume the bulk of the articles upon which it is proposed to impose new or increased taxes and must pay the bulk of the increase, is not heard in protest against such inequitable taxation, taxation that would put the costs of the war upon the industrious, relieve those who do not toil with brain or muscle, but live on rents and interest derived from accumulated wealth, of contributing to the costs of the war in proportion to their means.

So also do the moneyed interests make felt their demand that bonds shall be issued, that greenbacks shall not be. They insist that bonds shall be issued, contraction in the volume of currency be thus occasioned, money made dearer and man cheaper; they protest against an issue of greenbacks that would make money cheaper and man dearer, thus bringing greater comforts to the man by increasing the rewards of industry, stimulating enterprise and adding in an unmeasurable degree to the productive force and tax paying power of the country. Yet the voice of men who would profit from an issue of greenbacks, who would be made cheaper by the issue of bonds, is not heard demanding greenbacks and opposing bonds. Naturally there is every promise that the wishes of the moneyed interests as to taxes and bonds will be acceded to. Then the great common people will suffer, suffer much if the war is prolonged, then they will complain, but who will be to blame?

THERE is only one of the proposed taxes bearing on accumulated wealth that is likely of adoption. That is the tax on inheritances estimated to yield a revenue of about \$9,000,000 a year and that was voted for in the Senate Finance Committee by both Republicans and Democrats. The vote of the Republicans came as a surprise.

This tax Senator Chilton, of Texas, referred to as "contain-

ing more elements of justice than any other feature of the pending bill." And it is the truth though it must be admitted that the proposed inheritance tax is not as just and equitable as an inheritance tax should be. An inheritance tax fairly and equally distributed is as just and fair a tax as it is possible to devise outside of an income tax. As fair as an income tax it cannot be for there is one element of inequality that must creep in perpetually because of the varying lengths of men's lives, and the varying periods that men, receiving property by inheritance, may enjoy such property. Thus a fortune may be inherited one year and upon the early death of the recipient change hands again in the very next year while another fortune inherited may be enjoyed by the recipient for a generation, and after payment of one inheritance tax be free from a second for a generation while upon the other fortune would fall two inheritance taxes within a year. It is quite supposable even that one fortune might not change hands during half a century while another fortune might change hands several times, in which case no tax would be paid on the one fortune and several on the other.

Of course, in the long run there is every likelihood of an evening up of such inequalities, for there is likely to be an evening up of the number of times fortunes pass by inheritance, for generations in different families are prone to be much of the same length. Yet it must be recognized that there is no certainty of such evening up, for fortunes do not all pass down from generation to generation by any means, and, on the other hand, not infrequently is a generation skipped, a fortune being willed to grand-children, in which case there would be paid but one tax in two generations. Then many fortunes pass by inheritance to the same generation, in which case there would be paid two taxes in one generation. Thus an inheritance that passed from husband to wife and from wife to children would pay double the tax of an inheritance from father to children. So an inheritance tax is sure to fall heavier on some fortunes than on others, though, as we have said, there is quite sure to be an evening up in the long run. An income tax justly laid would be open to no such objection, indeed it would, justly collected—and it can be justly collected, all material evasions be rendered impossible—be a tax absolutely equitable, a tax that would cause each man to contribute to the costs of government the same amount on each dollar of his income, which is the acme of a just system of taxation.

THE proposed inheritance tax is not, as we have said, as just as an inheritance tax should be. It is not for it taxes large inheritances proportionately more than small. Again it taxes the man who receives an inheritance of \$100,000 more if that inheritance is a part of a fortune of \$1,000,000, than if the fortune willed is but a hundred thousand dollars all told. To be just, an inheritance tax ought to bear on all inheritances alike; the person who is willed a fortune of \$20,000 should receive it with the same tax off, dollar for dollar, as the person who is willed \$5,000,000. That is, if there be levied a succession tax of 5 per cent. on great fortunes there should be levied the same on small so that all beneficiaries would have to pay a tax of five cents on each dollar inherited. If he to whom a fortune of \$5,000,000 is willed receives it less an inheritance tax of \$250,000, he who is willed a fortune of \$20,000 should receive it less a proportionate tax, which would be \$1,000.

On this point we quite agree with Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, who declared his belief in speaking upon the inheritance tax that "as a matter of sound taxation, the object is to tax the dollar and not the man," that "the dollar should be taxed, whether it is \$1 in twenty thousand or \$1 in five million." And this, the proposed inheritance tax, does not do. It exempts fortunes of \$10,000 or less from taxation altogether, and on fortunes of more than that amount the rate of taxation increases with the fortune, so that the larger the fortune the greater would be the tax, dollar for dollar. This may be popular but it is not just

taxation. It is just as unjust to tax the dollar of the rich man more than the dollar of the man of moderate means as it is to tax the dollar of the poor man more than the dollar of the rich man, as we now systematically do.

It may be urged that as the unjust taxing of the dollar of the poor man more than the dollar of the rich has done much to build up the great fortunes of to-day, that it would be no more than just to now turn the tables and tax the dollar of the rich man more than the dollar of the poor, and thus return by taxation to the state and thus the general public a part of the fortunes that the rich have been enabled to accumulate by a system of unjust taxation that put their share of the costs of government upon the general public. But in thus roughly striving after justice we would run great risk of doing injustice. There can be no justice in taxing a fortune of \$10,001 passing by inheritance and exempting a fortune of \$10,000. If the fortune of \$10,000 is to be exempted, \$10,000 of the fortune of \$10,001 should also be exempted, so that on such fortune passing by inheritance the tax would fall upon but \$1.

AS WAS to have been expected, the inheritance tax met with much opposition from some Republicans who deem it a sacrilege to tax accumulated wealth, deem it proper and right that the brawn of the nation should pay the taxes. Senator Lodge spoke against this tax, not as inherently unjust, but as "taking from the states one of their necessary sources of revenue." He went on to say that the Constitution of the United States has much narrowed the field of taxation which the states have, and that Congress should not further narrow it. But the field of taxation which the states have is taxation on all property, on all accumulated wealth, on all the income of the people, whether earnings derived from muscle and brain, or income from accumulated wealth. The only taxes reserved to the United States are duties on imports, the only taxes forbidden to the states are taxes on imports and exports.

The only taxes reserved to the national government are, then, certain taxes on consumption. In common with the states the Congress of the United States can tax everything else, tax property of all kinds, tax earnings, tax income, with this difference: The states can impose taxes on real and personal property, taxes on incomes, equitably, that is, tax property according to its value, incomes proportionately to their size, so that all men can be taxed for the support of the states proportionately to their means. But this the United States cannot do under the rulings of the Supreme Court. Such taxes the United States may impose, but it must apportion them among the states, not proportionately to their wealth, but proportionately to their numbers. Thus a tax on real estate imposed by the United States might be twice as heavy in South Carolina as in New York, an income tax two or three times as heavy if on all incomes, and if on incomes of over \$4,000 not unlikely a hundred times as heavy. And so from the imposition of taxes on accumulated wealth or the income derived from accumulated wealth the Congress of the United States is practically interdicted. Before it can devise a just system of taxation there must be an overturning of the membership of the court that overturned all previous decisions and declared the income tax unconstitutional or there must come a change in our fundamental law.

THE objection urged to such a tax that it would deprive the States of a necessary source of taxation is not an objection at all. There is no reason why nation and states alike should not collect an inheritance tax. Under the Constitution the national tax would simply come in ahead of the state tax. It was, indeed, urged that the states would have to repeal their inheritance taxes in such event, because if they did not, there would be double taxation and injustice result. There would, of

course, be double taxation, but what injustice would there be in this? It is said that it would result in heavier taxation of inheritances in some states than in others, and for the reason that some states have inheritance taxes, others none at all, that, therefore, there would be but single taxation of inheritances in some states and double in others. And this is, of course, true, but it would result in no inequality in the taxation of inheritances in different states that does not now exist, that is not now made by state law. As far as inequality goes there can be no more inequality in taxing inheritances in all states once and in some twice than in taxing inheritances in some once and in the others not at all.

Senator Elkins spoke against the bill in the same vein: "If this is to go on," he said, "I want to know what the states will have left to tax the people. If the general government exercises this prerogative of taxing property on the one side and the state governments on the other, and the counties and cities tax, too, what will be the end of taxation, where will it stop and how can business survive under taxation by all constituted authority?" And then taking up the assertion that England has succession taxes, that every country in the world has them, he replied that in England there is but one tax, that of the national government, but here that it is proposed to impose two. "A man with property," he continued, "will not be able to survive if this principle travels as fast as it has been traveling in the last few years in Congress. If you have state, city, county and the national government tax the same property over and over again this is the beginning of the end."

But for this plaint of the millionaire there is no foundation. If there is a certain amount of money to be raised on a property what difference does it make to the owner whether the tax is a double or a single one, whether the national government tax the whole amount, or the nation half and the state half? Obviously none, and where the total amount of taxation is lighter the tax on property will be lighter whether the tax is half national and half state or not. And the proposed national succession tax added to the highest state tax on inheritances does not come to as high a rate as the British tax, the two taxes would be less than the one.

The only objection to such tax is that it is a tax that will fall on those who have largely escaped the burden of national taxation in the past. "Let us tax beer, tax whiskey, tax everything that is taxable, and tax salaries if you please," cried Senator Elkins, that is, tax everything but accumulated wealth and income derived therefrom, tax the poor but let the rich escape. That is the Senator Elkins idea of just taxation.

BY SUCH men the corporation tax was, of course, vehemently opposed. And in this opposition they were joined by the great body of Republicans. To oppose the corporation tax takes less courage, for opposition can be based with show of reasonableness on other ground than opposition to the taxation of accumulated wealth, not a very popular ground to take. In the first place, a sound objection can be urged against the tax as proposed, inasmuch as the tax is on gross, not net receipts. And as in different businesses net receipts bear very different proportions to gross receipts, this is bound to result in great inequality of taxation, in taxing the earnings of some corporations more than others. And the corporations that would be taxed the most, that is most proportionately to their net earnings, are those engaged in manufacturing and which buy large quantities of raw or partially fabricated materials, purchase of which materials takes a very large percentage of their gross receipts leaving but a comparatively small percentage to meet the costs of fabrication and remain over as profits. Naturally the percentage of the net profits of such corporations to gross receipts is small and as the tax would rest on gross receipts the percentage of tax to net

receipts would be, proportionately to the tax on the net earnings of other corporations spending less of their gross receipts for raw materials, very large. The tax on corporations doing a mercantile business would be especially heavy for the percentage of their profits to gross receipts is quite small. It is clear that a corporation whose net earnings were but 5 per cent. of gross receipts would have to pay a tax of practically ten times as much as the corporation with net earnings equal to 50 per cent. of gross receipts. It is on net earnings, not gross receipts, that the corporation tax should rest to be equitable. That it does not is a fair objection.

THE great objection made to this tax is, however, that it would be a discriminating tax in favor of private firms, that it would lay a tax on corporations while private firms doing just the same business would escape. But in this there is no injustice. Those who incorporate their business and carry on business under a corporate name enjoy certain exemptions that private firms do not. One exemption is that from unlimited liability for debts. Those who incorporate their business in general free themselves from all liability for debts in excess of the capital invested. To secure such exemption many men, especially in their later years when they wish to be free from the cares of business, when they feel that they must give way to younger men, and when they wish to be free from the danger of the loss of outside investments, as well as of their capital invested in business from possible mismanagement of junior partners, incorporate their businesses. Such exemption they deem of value, such exemption the state secures to them, and for such exemption it is only right that they should pay.

Further, to tax private firms as well as corporations would defeat the purpose of the tax which is to reach the capitalist, the stockholder. If private firms were also taxed, prices would probably be advanced to pay the tax and thus the tax fall on the consumer. In some instances where corporations do all the business or nearly all, it will be prone to do so anyhow, which means the great trusts, which are especially aimed at, would very likely escape the tax by passing it on.

IT SEEMS to be an unwritten tenet of Republican Senators that the strong shall go free, the weak be taxed. It seems to be thought quite proper that contributions to Republican campaign funds should be made good at the expense of the nation and those who refuse to contribute for the support and uses of the Republican organization, down to the buying of votes. It seems to be an unwritten law that those who contribute shall go free, that those who refuse shall pay several times as taxes the amount of the contributions asked of them. Foundation for such belief is given by the changes made in the schedule relating to proprietary articles. As the bill was reported to the Senate it levied a tax upon everything that was made or sold under a trade mark or patent right, in addition to medicinal and other preparations. This was right, for it fell on all alike, though the taxes were not just, for they were so imposed as to amount to but a small percentage on packages or articles of considerable value, but to a very great percentage on the packages of little value. Nevertheless, so far as it fell on all kinds of men without preference or prejudice, it was just. But in this shape it struck many things manufactured by large corporations and, so runs the press dispatch, "the protests against the proposed tax became so influential that the members of the committee retreated to cover, and took that section again under advisement, with the intention of materially modifying it. This they have done by eliminating everything that could possibly have been taxed under the section, except medicinal preparations." And this is class legislation.

THIS week again have reports of a Franco-Spanish alliance been persistent. That there is any basis for them we cannot

believe, for Spain has nothing to give in return for the aid and succor of France. It is true that France is nearer to war with Britain than many believe, but in such a war, Spain, already over-matched and quite without prospect of fighting her own battles with success, could render to France no assistance, while for France to enter into such an alliance would but bring down upon her the mailed hand of the United States that is far from being occupied with Spain. That the French Government would be guilty of any such folly when face to face with a war with Britain we cannot believe. By so doing she would but play into the hands of her enemy.

It may be that reports of such alliance are of British manufacture and not of French origin at all, that Britain is spreading what it would be folly for France to spread. To sow seeds of enmity, to sever the old-time friendship between France and the United States is Britain's interest, and a pressing interest now that England and France are at sword points. To bring America and France to sword points at the same time would be a great victory for her, it would profit her much, but the United States it would cost much. In our fight with Spain we need no and want no British assistance. If Britain comes to blows with France our aid would be invaluable, not so much in the way of active fighting, but as a counter to Russia, not so much in the way of military force, as in a source of food supply. With Russia and the United States against England she could not fight for a joint embargo on food exports would starve her. With the United States on her side starved into submission she could not be, not unless her fleets were driven from the command of the seas.

England does not give something for nothing; inviting us to an alliance she invites us to give a very material something for nothing. Of biting at proposals we should be chary. In another column we print a set of resolutions of the Irish American societies of Philadelphia commemorative of the Irish rebellion of 1798 and that are opportune. Bitterly hostile to Britain as they are they set forth the true attitude for the United States to assume. The future greatness of our country is to be attained not by dependence on Great Britain, not by dependence on any foreign monarchy but dependence on ourselves. That should be the keynote of our foreign policy. And so far as it can be made so by Irish-Americans it will so be made. Entitled to a voice in the destiny of our country they claim to be by their part in the making of the nation. And what is more they have a voice. It is given by the million voters of Irish birth or parentage in America, by the million and a half or two million more of Irish lineage.

COMING POPULIST CONFERENCES AT OMAHA.

AROUND the middle of June Omaha will be the Mecca for Populists. At that city, on the 13th of next month, the National Reform Press Association will meet in annual convention. For the same date and same place Chairman Park has called a meeting of the National Organization Committee of the Peoples party, a committee chosen at Nashville on July 4th a year ago by those Populists who feared that Senator Butler was leading the party to absorption by the Democratic party and hence its destruction, and who charged that committee to watch over the welfare of the Peoples party and take steps to preserve its independence. And finally the call has been issued by Senator Butler, Chairman of the National Committee of the Peoples party for a meeting of that committee at Omaha on June 15th. This call Senator Butler has issued pursuant to a referendum vote taken at the instance of Mr. Pomeroy, of New Jersey, to ascertain the wishes of the National Committee. And under the rules of the National Committee the Chairman must carry out the wishes of the majority of his committee when thus expressed. The rules governing the National Committee are that the Chair-

man shall, upon petition of any three or more members of that committee, submit, in writing, to the members of the committee any proposition which the petitioners may desire to have submitted and carry out the wishes of the majority of the committee as ascertained by the vote returned by the committeemen upon such proposition.

So, pursuant to such rule and upon petition of several committeemen gotten up by Mr. Pomeroy, Chairman Butler put to the members of the National Committee by letter the question of holding a meeting of the committee at some date in June on or prior to the 15th, and if so at what place. The members of the committee voted by a large majority, 73 to 18, in favor of holding a meeting, and the majority of those voting in favor voted for Omaha as the place. In compliance with this vote Chairman Butler has called a meeting for Omaha on June 15th, the last day of grace under the instructions of his committee.

Thus it is that in the week beginning Monday, June 13th, there will be a general assembling of leading Populists in Omaha. The question will there be taken as to whether the Peoples party shall in the future be independent or dependent upon the Democratic party. Chairman Butler will, no doubt, work to hold the party to dependence on the Democratic, and do all in his power to influence his committee to so vote. If it does so vote it will vote as a committee no longer representative of a party, a committee representative of only those who were once Populists, but who have virtually gone back into the Democratic party, who work no longer for the supremacy of the Peoples, but of the Democratic party, and they are very few. In brief, the National Committee, if it so act, will cease to be a Populist committee, cease to stand for those who are resolved that the Peoples party shall live, resolved that it shall be independent of the Democratic party, as of the Republican, and who will speak through the National Organization Committee of the Peoples party that has grown out of the Nashville conference, grown to hold aloft the banners of true Populism, preserve the independence and integrity of the party, as Senator Butler has sought to drag the party to its disintegration in the wake of the Democracy.

This National Organization Committee will meet two days before the meeting of Chairman Butler's committee, and, pursuant to the command of the rank and file of the party, expressed through the referendum vote, the results of which for one district we have given in another column, will issue the call for a national convention of the Peoples party to meet on July 4th next. Of the members of this committee many are also members of the National Committee, which should endorse this call, and will, if it is a committee representative of a live party, and not of a fragment of a party dead through absorption into the Democratic.

What the National Organization Committee will do there is no doubt; the course of the committee of which Mr. Butler is chairman, is wrapt in some doubt. This latter committee was originally constituted by the state and territorial delegates to the St. Louis Populist Convention choosing each three representatives. But the personnel of this committee has since undergone considerable change. The rules adopted by the St. Louis Convention for the guidance of this committee provided that the Populists of any state or territory might change their representation on the National Committee at any regularly called state or territorial convention, recall any member or members whose conduct might not be approved or whose removal might be desired on any ground and substitute a new member or members thereof. Power was also given to the Peoples party state or territorial conventions to fill any vacancies caused by death or resignation.

Pursuant to this rule many states have changed one or more of their national committeemen. The moving cause of this substitution has been the dissatisfaction with members who made part of a Peoples party committee but worked, like Chairman Butler, for the advancement of the Democratic party. It is all very well for the men who have so worked to offer the excuse

that by so acting they were best promoting Populist principles, that the success of the Democratic party was the quickest road to the attainment of the aims of the Peoples party, aims that since July, 1896, have been ever more and more akin to the aims of the Democratic party. In short, they urged that the Democratic party had become populist and that therefore it was best to abandon the Peoples party and work for the Democratic party. But many Populist state conventions have thought otherwise. To many, such explanations have not been satisfactory, such excuses not acceptable. And so many have recalled members of the National Committee as non-representative and substituted new men opposed to the Butler policy of holding the Peoples party in dependence on the Democratic party.

As the result of such changes the majority that Senator Butler counted in the committee as favorable to his policy, began to melt away. Then it was that some New England members of the committee devised a plan, an amendment to the rules governing the membership of the National Committee, whereby they sought to prevent the turning out of members voting with Chairman Butler and the substitution of new men opposed to dependence in the Democracy and ready to vote a declaration of independence for the Peoples party. This plan was to change the rules so that no state could change its representation without the approval of the National Committee, so that the Populists of no state could remove a member as non-representative, as untrue to Populism, unless the National Committee considered such member untrue. Thus those who wanted to make the Peoples party dependent on the Democracy sought to constitute themselves the judges of what members of the committee were and were not representative Populists, they urged the National Committee to make itself supreme, its will as superior to the will of the people, urged it to usurp the power to say to the Populists of any state dissatisfied with a member of the National Committee: "That man shall continue to represent you whether you like him or not, shall continue to represent you even though you demand his recall; of his fitness to represent you the National Committee, of which he himself is part, shall be final judge."

An amendment to the rules governing the selection of members of the National Committee and to this effect, was, as we have said, proposed by three members of that committee from New England to Chairman Butler and by him, in compliance with their request, to the members of the National Committee. By such committeemen, voting by mail, the amendment was turned down by an overwhelming majority. Therefore, all the members of the National Committee chosen since the St. Louis convention by state conventions and in place of members recalled as unrepresentative of the Peoples party, should be duly recognized as members by Chairman Butler at Omaha at the meeting on June 15th. For refusal to so recognize them he can have no good excuse, nor can he rightly recognize as members of the committee men in whose places new committeemen have been substituted by Populist state conventions, should such men present themselves at the meeting of the National Committee, for they are no longer members of that committee. We have no reason to believe that Chairman Butler will refuse to recognize new members and insist on recognizing the old, but there is not a little ground upon which to rest suspicion.

But whether Senator Butler strives to keep control of the committee, of which he is chairman, by arbitrary rulings or no, whether he succeeds in influencing that committee to vote for continuance of the policy of dependence on the Democratic party or not, whether that committee declares itself representative of those who, once Populists, have been absorbed into the Democratic party, or whether, refusing to follow the lead of Senator Butler and cease to be a committee entitled to receive any recognition as a Peoples party committee, it declares that the Peoples party is and of right ought to be independent, there can be no doubt that there will be declared at Omaha the independence of

the Peoples party, for the National Organization Committee, a committee representing those who hold the Peoples party is a party and who constitute the vast majority of all those who ever voted a Peoples party ticket, will so declare whether the National Committee does or does not.

"CO-OPERATE AND CONQUER"—A REPLY TO SENATOR BUTLER.

AT THE Omaha Populist Conferences of June 13th to 15th, next, and of which we have already spoken, co-operation with the Democratic party will no doubt be urged by Senator Butler and his friends with all the power at their command. Populists will no doubt be told: Co-operate and conquer. But how can there be co-operation until there is a community of aims? It is impossible, and there is now great diversity of aims between Populists and Democrats. Of the wide differences between the Democrats and Populists over the questions of money and transportation, the two greatest questions before the American people, we need not go into detail here. Neither need we speak at length of the disagreement of Democrats and Populists as to the principles of just taxation. Suffice it to say that it is a dishonest monetary system that favors the idle at the expense of the industrious, a dishonest and unfair management of our transportation systems that gives lower rates and prompter services to the few than to the many, that enriches the cliques, the trusts and the combines to the ruin of the independent producers, and an inequitable system of taxation that puts the burdens of government upon the poorer citizens while government is perverted to confer special privileges upon the wealthier, that build up the moneyed oligarchy and crush down the many who should be free and happy and prosperous, the bulwark of liberty and the Republic.

The growth of the moneyed oligarchy all good citizens view with alarm, but many there are who do not recognize the causes or, gaining but a glimmer of the causes, mistake the remedy. And the masses of Democratic voters come in this latter category, the masses of Republicans in the former. Few are the Republicans who recognize the causes of the growth of this oligarchy. They feel the effects in ever increasing interest charges, they feel the effects of higher transportation rates for independent producers than for their rivals, the trusts and monopolies, they feel the effects of inequitable taxation, taxation that taxes the man and not the dollar. But though they feel the effects they do not recognize that debts and interest charges are increasing, let alone attribute such increase to the true cause—a dishonest monetary system. They recognize the fall in prices, they cannot help it, but they do not grasp the significance of the fact that it is only as measured by money that prices have generally fallen, a fact that goes to show that the fall in prices is nothing more nor less than a rise in money, not a cheapening of the things measured, not a cheapening of man and the products of his labor, but a lengthening of the measure. So also do they see trusts and monopolies flourish, but they do not connect such abnormal growths with discriminations in freight rates, discriminations that make it impossible for the producer who keeps himself above the taint of corruption, does not stoop to the bribery of railroad officials for special favors, to succeed. Nor do the masses of Republican voters recognize that the national system of taxation weighs unduly upon the poor and releases the rich from their just share of taxation. They feel the inequalities of taxation, yet such inequalities they do not recognize. In a word they feel, but they do not see, they are honest and quick to resent fancied injuries, but against the real evils they make no headway, for in their ignorance they are helpless.

And how is it with the masses of Democratic voters? They

are led to see great evils in the growth of the moneyed oligarchy, led to see in that oligarchy all the causes that make their struggle for a livelihood so hard. So to this oligarchy they make resistance. But the opposition made by the Democratic party to such oligarchy is heedless. So far as the masses of the party are concerned, so far as many of the leaders are concerned it is an honest opposition. But give the Democratic party power and give power to those in the Democratic party who are honest in their opposition to this moneyed oligarchy and they would accomplish nothing. They would accomplish nothing, for they have but a glimmer of the causes that build up this oligarchy and having only a glimmer of the causes, and of but one of the causes, they would be unable to remove those causes.

For the cause of the growth of great monopolies and trusts, for the causes that have led to the upbuilding of the moneyed oligarchy they have been taught to look to the protective tariff. From the true cause, dishonestly managed railroad systems, they have been taught to look away. And the masses of Democratic voters do not recognize the gross enormity of discrimination in railroad rates to this day, they do not recognize such discrimination as an evil at all. Yet it is railroad discrimination that has been the prime cause in the building up of trusts and monopolies. Not recognizing this cause they have, of course, no remedy to propose. And while they have been taught to look at the protective tariff as a system of taxation whereby many dollars are collected from the people in the shape of enhanced prices for protected goods and turned into the pockets of the protected manufacturers to one turned into the National Treasury, they have been led to believe that just taxes would be beer taxes and whiskey taxes and customs duties on sugar and coffee and tea and such produce as we do not produce, for, it is said, that while such taxes would add to the cost of the taxed products all the enhanced cost paid by the consumers would find its way into the National Treasury.

That such taxes being on products of general consumption of rich and poor alike would amount to per capita taxes, would result in taxing man and not wealth, in taxing the man earning a dollar a day as much as the man with a daily income of a thousand they do not grasp. And such taxes we are still told by Democrats are just, though it is taxes of this character that have done much in the upbuilding of the moneyed oligarchy. It is only recently that many Democratic leaders have come to advocacy of an income and kindred taxes thereby proposing to put some of the burdens of government on accumulated wealth. Yet while advocating an income tax as a means of raising a small part of the revenues of the National Government they prove not abandoned advocacy of their revenue taxes that are peculiarly taxes on man and not on the dollar. The only just system of taxation is one that weighs equally on the dollar of every man, just as much on the dollar of the rich man as on the dollar of the poor, that is distributed so that if the poor man pays a tax of ten cents on every dollar he receives the rich man shall pay a like tax so that if he receives a hundred dollars where the poor man receives one he shall pay ten dollars where the poor man pays ten cents. In other words all men should contribute the same percentage of their income to pay the costs of government.

To recapitulate, one of the great causes for the growth of the moneyed oligarchy, namely railroad discrimination, the Democratic party does not recognize, and not recognizing, it could not remove. And a second cause, inequitable taxation, a tax on man and not on the dollar, Democrats have long urged and having now but a glimmer of the gross inequality of such taxation they would but in part remove such cause.

The other great cause of the growth of this oligarchy, a dishonest monetary system, it is said Democrats do recognize and would remove. But they do and they don't. They do recognize that the cause of the great fall in prices that has so unjustly

increased the burden of all debts, enriched the creditor classes at the expense of the industrious, is to be found in a dishonest monetary system, in an appreciation of money. The remedy for such evils is surely the establishment of an honest monetary system. But the way to attain such a system the Democrats do not point out. Indeed, they propose to apply remedies that would not secure an honest system, a policy that though well meant might not unlikely result in strengthening the moneyed oligarchy. While striving to undo that oligarchy there is grave reason to fear that if entrusted with power they would play into its hands. And when we say this we do not mean the danger that those friends of the moneyed oligarchy, and who wear the cloak of Democracy, would turn the party to the support of the gold standard, as serious as that danger is. We have reference to the probable policy of those Democrats honestly opposed to the moneyed oligarchy should they have full power. Democrats have ever opposed the granting to the national banks of the power to issue paper money to the exclusion of state banks. The monopoly of the national banks they have pledged themselves again and again to destroy, they have pledged themselves to repeal the prohibitive tax on state bank currency so that there might be, as they put it, free banking, so that state banks might issue bank notes.

And what would the giving of such power to state banks result in? Democrats have opposed putting the issue of all paper money in the hands of the national banks as sure to result in suspension of specie payments and an irredeemable bank currency. And so would result the granting of the power to issue notes to the state banks.

The granting of such power would surely be followed by bank inflation, for in such inflation the banks would find a source of profit. The inevitable results would be a speculative rise in prices, a great increase in imports, and at the same time a decrease of exports. Then would follow in sequence specie exports, a demand on the banks for the redemption of their notes, and, of course, depletion of their specie reserves. To replenish such reserves they would have to call in loans. But such a course would knock the bottom from under the enhanced prices built on bank inflation and inaugurate a panic which the banks could not escape. Rather than face such a panic the banks would suspend specie payments. It would not be the first time in the history of the country that they have done so under similar circumstances. And the banks suspended, what would we have as our measure of value? An irredeemable bank currency, the value of which would be regulated by its volume. And such volume the banks could regulate, for free from all care on the score of providing specie for redemption, they would be free from all restraint.

So we would have if the Democrats had their way—what? Exactly what the moneyed oligarchy, the speculative cliques long for, a monetary system that would give them the power to depress and raise prices at will and thus strip producers of their property by first wrecking their properties by making industry unprofitable and then instilling value into such properties by making industry profitable until they could dispose of such properties at handsome advances over the wreckage prices. Constantly falling prices, be it observed, the moneyed classes do not want, for the result of such fall is in the end to turn owners of debts into owners of property and while their interests as creditors, as owners of debts lie in falling prices their interests as owners of property lie in rising prices. They want a see-saw in prices which they can control, and an irredeemable bank currency would offer them such control. Thus we repeat the Democrats, if put in power, and as honestly opposed to the moneyed oligarchy as the masses are, would be prone to play square into the hands of such oligarchy.

The honest monetary system must be one under which the volume of money would be regulated in accordance with the

demands for money, regulated so as to give a stability to the value of money and a permanence to the general level of prices. And this can only be done by increasing the volume of money if prices tend to fall, decreasing it if they tend to rise. And in a healthy state of business this means there must be a constant increase in the volume of money, for with the progress of invention and the growth of trade the demands for money will increase, and if such demands are not filled money will grow dear, prices will fall and the industrial classes be thus deprived of the benefits accruing from the progress of invention and the growth of trade.

It is clear that there can be no certainty that there will be such increase in currency as demanded unless some one is free to issue such currency. And that someone cannot be the banks, for the banks, controlled by the speculative cliques, would surely abuse such power and regulate the issue of currency in the interest of the speculative cliques. That someone must be the government, and the government cannot be free to supply such currency if it is dependent upon the production of gold and silver. And the Democrats would make the government thus dependent. It is urged they would issue greenbacks, but if they did they would issue greenbacks redeemable in coin, and the volume of such notes must be dependent on the volume of coin. Therefore, the establishment of an honest monetary system is not to be expected from the Democratic party. Such a system must rest upon the issue of notes that shall not be redeemable in coin, that shall be promises to receive for taxes and all public dues, not promises to pay.

Thus we see that the moneyed oligarchy has its growth in a dishonest monetary system, but a dishonest monetary system the Democrats put in power would not remove, but perhaps all unwittingly stumble into giving the moneyed cliques just what they desire. Thus we see that the moneyed oligarchy has its growth in a dishonestly managed transportation system, but this cause Democrats do not recognize and would not remove. Thus we see the moneyed oligarchy has its growth in an inequitable system of taxation, but such cause of its growth Democrats would at most but in part remove. And thus it is that Populists who recognize the true causes for the growth of the moneyed oligarchy and propose the true remedies cannot help Democrats into power.

It is true that to conquer the moneyed oligarchy co-operation of those opposed to it is necessary. The co-operation of Democrats and Republicans and Populists, who view with alarm the growth of the moneyed oligarchy, that ever grows more insolently overbearing and threatening to the life of the Republic, is much needed. It is, indeed, imperative if the Republic is to be preserved, if liberty and equality are to obtain recognition, if a true democracy is to be unfolded in the United States. But such co-operation can only be brought about in one way. There is now great diversity between Populists and Democrats. And while that diversity exists there can be no co-operation, no more than there can be co-operation of the armies of two states until common aims and manner of attaining those aims are agreed upon.

While there is diversity of opinion, diversity of aims, there can be no co-operation. Agreement must first be come to as to the causes of the growth of the moneyed oligarchy and the manner of removing such causes. This come to, there can be co-operation. But between men sovereign over their minds and votes common conviction as to the nature of the causes and the propriety of remedies must precede agreement. By convincing men of different political parties of the justice, utility, and hence advisability of a certain line of policy, agreement can be come to. To bring about co-operation between those honest men of all parties, who view the growth of the moneyed oligarchy with alarm, this must be done. When this is accomplished there will be co-operation, but it will be co-operation by men joining the party that they are convinced holds sound principles, or, in the want of such a party, forming themselves into a new.

Fortunately there is not the want of such a party, not the necessity of building anew, for the Peoples party holds to true principles, points out the policies that will free our people from the deadening grasp of the moneyed oligarchy. It lies, therefore, with the Peoples party to bring about co-operation and conquer. It does not lie within the power of any other party. With the Democratic party there cannot be co-operation for its triumph would not mean the conquest of the moneyed oligarchy. With the Peoples party there can be co-operation, for its triumph would mean such conquest. To bring about such co-operation Populists have to convince the majority of our people of this. By convincing a majority of the men of all parties that they are right, that they stand in opposition to special privileges and for equality of opportunity for all, Populists can bring about co-operation. It is only by so convincing men that co-operation can be attained and victory over the moneyed oligarchy attained, for agreement must precede co-operation.

Thus to convince Democrats and Republicans is a stupendous task, but it must be done if the battle with those who seek to enslave our people to an oligarchy of wealth is to be won. The convincing of a majority of voters, a majority that must be drawn from all parties, that the Peoples party is right is a great undertaking and a labor of time. Therefore it is that Populists must get at this labor at once, start their campaign for 1900, so that no time may be lost in getting at the work of convincing Democrats and Republicans that the Peoples party is right and gaining their co-operation, without which victory is impossible.

It is indeed co-operate and conquer. Therefore let that co-operation be made possible of attainment. To make it possible of attainment there is but one way, and that is to convince a majority of voters of the justice, utility and advisability of the principles of Populism. The policies of the other parties are not true, the Democratic proposals would not, if put in force, lead to the conquest of the threatening oligarchy, and the closer those proposals are examined the more will their futility become apparent. Therefore co-operation with the Democratic party is out of the question. It cannot be brought about, for to convince a majority of voters of the effectiveness of the Democratic false remedies is an impossibility, for the closer they are examined the clearer must their falsity become. The only proposals that meet the requirements of the situation and that will stand examination are those of the Peoples party. Therefore let such examination be invited at once. By convincing Democrats and Republicans honestly opposed to the moneyed oligarchy and who, though now groping blindly, are anxious to do the right thing; by convincing them of the effectiveness of the Populist proposals, there can be brought about co-operation, the co-operation without which the people must suffer defeat at the hands of the moneyed oligarchy.

By thus convincing men co-operation is then possible and thus alone, and it is only possible to thus convince men in effective numbers by beginning now, by opening the campaign at once. To set this campaign in motion is the work before the Populists who will meet in Omaha around the middle of June, this work must be done if the moneyed oligarchy is to be dethroned and the people enthroned, a government of, by and for the people restored and preserved.

"IN its true nature, money is simply a right or title to demand some product or service from some one else. Now, when a person accepts money in exchange for products or services rendered, he can neither drink it nor clothe himself with it; nor is it any species of economic satisfaction for the service he has done. He only agrees to accept it for the service he has rendered because he believes or has confidence that he can purchase some satisfaction which he does want at any time he pleases. Money is, therefore, what is termed credit."—*Macleod, Theory of Credit.*

GLADSTONE; A STUDY.

OF most great public characters it is possible to take a summary view, which shall be fairly comprehensive and impartial. This is literally impossible in the case of Gladstone, for these reasons: his unexampled multifariousness demands consideration in detail if a just estimate is desired; his unique mentality must be understood before the results of its processes can be rightly explained and judged; and these together absolutely fail to portray the Gladstone of history unless we study them as influenced by the mighty upheavals, economic, political, social, religious, and in international relations, that marked the Victorian era of which, for nearly two generations, he was the most conspicuous figure.

So utterly hopeless is it to compress this last of the giants into the space of a half hour's reading, that, from very despair, one whose life has been a study of Gladstone in close touch with him and his every act can only envy those whose views from the distance are so boldly given in a sentence. No single student of Gladstone is to be trusted, whatever his estimate may be. Even history is unlikely to do full justice to one who was not one, but many in one, many contradictory units in an enigmatical whole. The popular mind draws its pictures of its heroes with bold lines. Gladstone's face and intellect and temperament outline themselves with strongest strokes, but these are so softened and changed by an infinity of fine hair-lines and the flashing of the spirit within that no single aspect, nor any six isolated aspects, reveal his complete self. The secret of Gladstone's greatness has been his personality. Posterity will have to content itself with this as the solution of its baffled efforts to construct so grand a force out of records in themselves apparently inadequate. His works as a statesman, his political speeches and his excursions in literature indicate the astounding capacity and versatility of his mind, unwearied up to the verge of his ninetieth year. They fail to convey the electric effect of those fiery eyes and the witchery of voice, gesture, and play of feature, responding so swiftly to the flaming enthusiasm within. Neither will his works of themselves explain the strange shiftings and reversals of those numerous enthusiasms. Nor can the phenomena of his captaincies of opposite forces and their conquests be judicially estimated apart from the peculiarities of this splendid personality.

With this note of caution for the student of Gladstone and his influence, it is clearly better to offer the judgments of his eminent friends and associates upon the late statesman's unique character than to obtrude a personal opinion. First, then, we quote men whose names vouch for their right to speak as they did, frankly in his hearing, of one whom they still honored. Then, with this light, we can view Gladstone as a champion of the people, as a world-statesman, as a churchman, as a friend of Ireland, as a financier, and as an orator and writer.

Mr. G. W. E. Russell, son of the late Lord Charles Russell, of the famous Whig house, is one of the group of rising young members of Parliament who were favorites of Gladstone. As a devoted follower and intimate of the family he wrote an authorized life of the then Premier, [1891] under whom he held office. From such a source these words have special significance. He says: "Whoever attempts to write a study of Mr. Gladstone's character undertakes to handle a complicated theme. He has to analyze a nature agitated and perplexed by a dozen cross-currents of conflicting tendency, and to assign their true causes to psychological phenomena which are peculiarly liable to misinterpretation." Again, having in mind how Gladstone was so often found advocating, when it was a winning cause, the principle or policy he had opposed while it was in its unpopular stage, Mr. Russell says: "His natural bias is to respect institutions as they are . . . and even when he is impelled by strong conviction to undertake the most fundamental and far-reaching alterations of

our polity, the innate conservatism of his mind makes him try to persuade himself that the revolution which he contemplates is indeed a restoration." The Rt. Hon. John Morley, of Gladstone's ministry, and his probable biographer, expressed this more bluntly when he wrote, "Mr. Gladstone's mind is a mint of logical counterfeits." The late Rt. Hon. W. E. Forster, Gladstone's Secretary for Ireland, said in Parliament, "Mr Gladstone has the great advantage of being able to convince his friends of most things and himself of anything." These, and more that could be cited, are singularly literal corroborations of Lord Macaulay's forecast of his rising friend's career, written over fifty years ago. "The more strictly Mr. Gladstone reasons on his premises the more absurd are the conclusions he brings out, and he is reduced sometimes to take refuge in arguments inconsistent with his fundamental doctrines, and sometimes to escape from the legitimate consequences of his false principles under cover of equally false history." This would not be quoted here if it did not so exactly fit into the changes of policy now to be noticed. Either these responsible men had sunk their honor or sense to wound the friend they loved none the less, or there was solid cause for their unusual criticisms.

Passing now to glance at Gladstone as the people's champion, it must be said once for all that all the facts referred to herein are presented with absolute fairness, and if space permitted they would be given with full details. His early Toryism and fitful transition into uncertain Radicalism is generally familiar, but not the circumstances surrounding each jump. Yet it is only by gauging these that a clear view can be obtained of the particular operation of his subtle intellect. As Mr. Russell says, Gladstone's natural bent was from first to last toward conservatism; the principle was never given up, as will be seen, and had not Disraeli adroitly turned from writing Revolutionary Epics to hold a banner for the Tory radicalism of the Young England party, it is more than probable that Gladstone would have continued to be the rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories. Both these champions were shrewd in foreseeing the advent of democracy, and from that time to the end of their days their rivalry was not so much to grasp and hold the reins of power as, in having grasped them, how best to restrain the horses while seeming to speed them.

It is only possible to give bare mention of some examples. Gladstone's earliest Parliamentary pleadings were in defence of slavery as scripturally, morally and politically right. His courage and eloquence secured a higher rate of compensation for his father's liberated slaves than was paid to others, and this was the family fortune. When the fiftieth anniversary of the abolition of slavery from British soil was celebrated Gladstone consistently absented himself. Lord Brougham's agitation for the abolition of "taxes on knowledge," which repressed and legally suppressed the right of free speech, was opposed by Gladstone because "taxes tend to prevent the circulation of bad reading." He opposed free trade for ten years. He opposed public school education for children of Nonconformists, because they were "a set of men whose business it will be to inculcate erroneous doctrines." When these liberal principles were taking hold of the people and there were signs of carrying them through, he protested on the ground that "England rests not her power on physical force, but on her principles, intellect and virtues. . . . (If slavery were to be abolished by force) I shall lament it as a signal for the ruin of the colonies and the downfall of the empire." His sympathies during our own Civil War were with the slave states. When his own party in 1864 was bent on extending the franchise to the working classes Gladstone helped the cause. "I venture to say that every man not presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness or of political danger (?) is morally entitled to come within the pale of the Constitution." Having satisfied his party spirit by his speech he compounded with his Conservative conscience by leaving the House without

voting for the bill he had supported. Another plea he made was that the suffrage was the right of all "who are our own flesh and blood." Yet in 1866 he wrote: "I do not agree in the demand either for manhood or household suffrage." In 1885, when supporting the enfranchisement of the illiterate agricultural laborer, he said: "I hold with Burke that knowledge and virtue alone have an intrinsic right to govern." In any reform he hoped "that a reasonable share of power may be allowed to the principle of birth."

In this connection it should be noted that the then Tory Ministry of sixteen members, of whom eight were peers, possessed a joint rent-roll of \$1,020,000 a year. A few months later Gladstone appointed his ministry of sixteen, including eight peers, and their rent-roll was \$1,705,000. Between 1868 and 1886 Lords Beaconsfield and Salisbury created sixty-one peers, and between 1869 and 1886 Gladstone had created seventy-four. How deeply this instinct of high Toryism affected even his extreme concessions to progressive necessities can only be realized by careful consideration of dates and party exigencies. Failing space for this we fall back on his biographer. "Even the House of Lords, which has so often mutilated and delayed great measures on which he set his heart, still has a definite place in his respect, if not in his affection. Indeed, he attaches to the possession of rank, and what it brings with it, an even exaggerated importance. In all the petty details of daily life, in his tastes, his habits, his manners, his way of living, his social prejudices, he is the stiffest of Conservatives."

In his championship of popular rights an important feature was the disestablishment of the Irish Church. He candidly admitted in his Midlothian campaign of 1879 that he undertook that work because a jail wall had been blown up and a policeman murdered in rescuing political prisoners. "At once the question of the Irish Church revived. It came within the range of practical politics. I myself took it up." The compensation he secured for the disestablished church made it richer than ever before. When the Nonconformists called upon him to apply the disestablishment principle to the English Church, Gladstone declined. At that very time, 1869, being Premier, he appointed his son, Stephen, a very young curate of a London church, to the family living of Hawarden, which he still holds, being then worth \$15,760 a year. When the Nonconformist vote became of vital importance to the Liberal leader, Gladstone invited their foremost ministers and politicians to breakfast and pleased them by avowing that "the Nonconformists are the backbone of England."

His various Irish policies belong to this section of our study. Again detail is all-important but impossible here. From 1832 until 1885 Gladstone was a consistent coercionist, looking, indeed, to measures for the relief of the people without hurting the landed interest too severely. From 1874 till 1880 there were 1,961 agrarian outrages in Ireland. When Gladstone came into power those outrages increased between 1880 and 1885 to 12,089. Home Rule, it was hoped, would, like the Church, come into "practical politics." Beaconsfield's garrison of 18,684 soldiers was increased to 29,361 in two years. One public meeting in eight was now suppressed, under the Tories it was only one in thirty-three. Toryism had created forty-four new legal offences. Gladstone's ministry added 500 new offences in six months. Under the former there had been 132 evictions in three months, which in the corresponding period under Gladstone rule swelled to 853. On assuming office in 1880 he said of Beaconsfield's six years government in Ireland that "there is an absence of crime and outrage and a general sense of comfort and satisfaction such as is unknown in the previous history of the country." When he brought in his Land Bill of 1881 Gladstone was indignantly surprised to hear Parnell describe his speech introducing it as "dishonest and unscrupulous" and himself characterized as "the greatest coercionist and most unrivalled slanderer of the

Irish nation." The next day, Oct. 10th, John Dillon said of him "his reputation for honesty in politics is a false reputation, and is based upon the power of skilfully misrepresenting facts." Three days later the present writer heard the Premier's triumphant announcement that these men had that day been clapped into jail. "It is idle to talk of law, or liberty, or religion, or civilization if these gentlemen are to carry through the chaotic schemes they have devised." There they were kept for five months without a trial. In 1885, when in opposition, Gladstone warned the Liberals that the Parnellites might hold the balance of power in the next Parliament, and if so, "I tell you seriously and solemnly that although I believe the Liberal Party to be honorable, patriotic, sound and trustworthy, yet it would be in such a position as that it would not be trustworthy. It would not be safe for it to enter upon the consideration of the principles of a measure in respect to which, at every step of its progress, it would be in the power of a party coming from Ireland to say, 'unless you do this, and unless you do that, we will turn you out to-morrow.'" [This passage is a capital example of Gladstonian principle, policy, and style of speech.] His anticipation came true, Parnell did hold the balance of power, whereupon Gladstone surprised the country by announcing his conversion to the principle of Home Rule. How that step ruptured his party, severed life-long friendships, isolated him from his principal political associates, alienated the sympathy of those he sought to serve, split the country into sections more embittered than over any question for half a century, and led to his own withdrawal, under a cloud, from the public life he had so long adorned, need not be more than recalled.

The remaining topics can only be rapidly summarized, but the facts are condensed with scrupulous regard for fairness. Gladstone's warmest defenders do not claim him as an enthusiastic Great Briton. Russell puts it that great masses of his countrymen have opposed his policies because of his "tendency to belittle England, to dwell on the faults and defects of Englishmen, to extol and magnify the virtues and graces of other nations, and to ignore the homely prejudice of patriotism." Earl Russell declared that "by his foreign policy Mr. Gladstone has tarnished the national honor, injured the national interests, and lowered the national character." Mr. Stead, his faithful henchman, says: "Somewhere, drowned in the great ocean of his speeches, there may be a passage in which he indulges in the proud swell of soul which every patriot must experience when contemplating the position accorded to his country in the peopling, governing and civilizing of the world, but it does not recur to memory." Mr. Stead goes on to claim that Gladstone "has done more than any single man to create Italy and to destroy the dominion of the Turk in Europe," forgetting that Gladstone wrote, in 1876, during his agitation over the "Bulgarian Horrors," these words: "As regards the territorial integrity of Turkey, I for one am still desirous to see it upheld." His ardent wish for the commercial supremacy of the United States was equalled by his devotion to the imperial interests of Russia, both necessarily at the cost of England. He established the principle of arbitration by the Geneva award for the Alabama claims; in 1878 he wrote this striking proof of his friendship for us: "The United States can, and probably will, wrest from us our commercial prosperity. . . . I have no inclination to murmur at the prospect. America is passing us by in a canter;" he denounced the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, a controlling interest, as a folly, although through it he was enabled to retain his hold on Egypt, while shooting down its subjects under Arabi for "struggling, and rightly struggling, to be free." He also wrote that England has no interest in India except the well-being of the natives, and if the Suez Canal were destroyed by an enemy, "we shall be the greatest losers, but it is a question of loss, and loss only." The expression, however, is still somewhat vague. His efforts to strengthen Greece, improve Egypt, to assist Russia in her natural

aspirations for extended power and a higher civilization, to secure independence for the Balkan states and Afghanistan, and his submission to military defeats in proof of his goodwill to the Transvaal republic, these and other acts vouch for his sincere devotion to the welfare of other nations. He took little if any interest in the British colonies. The dismal chapter which began with his invasion of Egypt in 1882 at a cost of \$35,000,000 and ended with the martyrdom of General Gordon three years later must be passed over in silence. Strangely enough, Gladstone, the hater and disbeliever in war, was one of the responsible makers of the useless Crimean war; the treaty, which was the only thing England had to show for that vast loss of life and treasure, was afterwards torn up by him in token of friendship for Russia. Gladstone was, in his official capacity and degree, responsible for ten wars between that one and 1884.

This fact goes far to account for the heavier taxation under his rule than under that of the Tories. From averaging sixty-six million pounds per annum between 1875 and 1880 it averaged over seventy-two millions a year under Gladstone. In his campaign of 1874 Gladstone promised, if placed in power, to abolish the income tax. He became Premier, and it at once doubled. As the cost of government went up the prosperity of the country went down during those years of "meddle and muddle" at home and abroad. Gladstone's reputation as a financier will ultimately rest rather on his unrivalled felicity in explaining the most intricate budgets with a lucidity and charm which made them interesting to everyone. His fiscal policies owed most of their success to the prosperous era in which he earned his fame as Chancellor of the Exchequer. He made great reductions in the National Debt, which have been considerably surpassed by his successors, while they have kept well under his average of national expenditure.

His domestic triumphs, for which his country owes his memory full recognition, have been the establishing of free trade, which flourished up to 1875, the repeal of the paper duty (those "taxes on knowledge" he upheld until the majority were against him), the enfranchisement of the small householder, the ballot, the school board, the opening of the universities to Non-conformists, and certain reforms in the tariff and land laws. These victories are emblazoned on the Liberal banner, without the ungracious postscript telling how most of them were won after long and hard fighting against the enemy, whose then Tory leader became the Liberal standard-bearer only when the tide of battle turned that way.

The charm of Gladstone's personality explains a popular delusion in England that he and his party have given the people the legislation that has shortened the hours of labor, protected the interests of working people and their benefit societies, and generally promoted their welfare. So far from this being the case, columns might be filled with the emphatic testimony of the best witnesses to the contrary, who give cordial credit to the Tory ministries for introducing and enacting these beneficent measures, some of which were opposed by Gladstone and his followers. From 1874 to 1887, there were forty-nine acts of Parliament passed for the special interest of working people, of which thirty-nine were carried by the Tories. Among these witnesses, all Liberals, are the late Prof. Fawcett, member of the Cabinet; the Duke of Argyll; the late Thomas Hughes, author of "Tom Brown's School Days" and a pioneer of co-operation; the late Labor M. P., Alex. Macdonald; George Ogden, a respected labor champion; Mr. Plimsoll, the sailors' friend, and many others.

From these testimonies, opinions and recorded facts may be constructed a figure whose admitted greatness none will dispute, though its aspects and interpretations will radically differ. If we can eliminate the politician unanimity of the happiest kind becomes possible. Posterity may not be able to put its finger on this or that achievement of statesmanship and say with confidence: Here is a monument of Gladstone, quarried and sculp-

tured by his sole genius. Neither are his living admirers able to put their finger on a single passage in all his speeches that shall compel posterity to feel its inspiring eloquence. He was given to long, involved, Latinized sentences, devoid of wit, epigram and the lightness of humor. None of his sayings have passed into the popular speech. His oratory owed all its power to his noble personality, to the play of his marvellously eloquent and beautiful countenance and the fire of zeal that blazed in his eyes. Now that that imperial personality is gone no written utterances of his or others can revive it. His immortal work was the inspiring of others with enthusiasms ennobled by his lofty ideals, for though in the inferior walks of public duty the purest patriot's robe gets soiled in the dust, his eye is fixed on the glory above. Gladstone was a staunch Church of England man, broad in the direction of the Roman and the Greek communions, with which historic institutions he long labored to reunite his beloved Anglican Church. His theology was that of an all but extinct school. His piety was a living force, profound, most impressive, as sweet to see as his indescribable charm of mind and person. The influence of a life like this must be farther reaching than can be measured or than any written records of it can be. History will place the most famed Premier of Victoria's memorable reign, the best loved and least understood leader of her people, in his proper niche in the temple of the nation's great, but for us who knew the living man there is nothing but poignant sorrow that a blaze of light has gone out, and the gloom of knowing we shall never see his like again.

O. H. G. L.

NO ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

Protest of Irish-Americans on the Anniversary of the Irish Rebellion of 1798 Against an Alliance With a People, the Oppressors of the Irish Race.

Abandon Not Old Friends, Put Not Reliance in the Interested Friendship of England, But Dependence in Ourselves.

AT THE final meeting of the Irish-American Societies, of Philadelphia, held in Industrial Hall, May 22d, under the presidency of Nicholas F. Redmond, for the arrangement of the grand centenary parade on Monday evening, May 23d, commemorative of the Irish rebellion of 1798, a parade participated in by upwards of 10,000 marchers, though a rainy night, the following resolutions were unanimously and enthusiastically adopted:

Resolved, That we, the representatives of 40,000 members of Irish-American societies in Philadelphia, in convention assembled, and, as we believe, expressing the views of the millions of our countrymen throughout the United States, pledge our hearty support to President McKinley in prosecuting the present war for the liberation of Cuba.

That, remembering with gratitude the invaluable aid rendered by France during the Revolution, and by Russia during the Civil War, the two darkest and most critical periods in the history of the republic, we will welcome in the present conflict such foreign friendship as the government finds available, but that we are unalterably opposed to any "entangling alliance" with the ancient enemy from whose open hostility in the hour of our peril we were so recently saved by the fleets of the Czar.

That the present proposed so-called "Anglo-Saxon alliance," viewed in the light of history, is an insult to the intelligence of the American people, not one in twenty of whom is, or ever was, "Anglo-Saxon."

The Celts' Part in Making the Nation.

That the present greatness of this country has been achieved, not by any one race, but by the combined wisdom, efforts and self-sacrifice of all here united under the proud name of American citizens. And that the names and lineage of twelve of its Presidents, from Jefferson to McKinley; of Patrick Henry, Alexander Hamilton, Charles Carroll, Witherspoon, Webster and Blaine, in

its councils and forum; of three-fourths of its greatest naval heroes, from Barry, Paul Jones, MacDonough, Perry, Decatur and Stewart to Farragut; of a long line of its famous generals, including among others, Montgomery, Lafayette, Sullivan, Stark, Wayne, Morgan, Marion, Jackson, Houston, Scott, Shields, Grant, Meade, Thomas, Corcoran, Meagher and Sheridan; of Norris in finance; Marshall in jurisprudence; Fulton in invention; Girard in philanthropy; Fremont in exploration; the Careys and Professor Thompson in political economy; and Greeley in journalism; of thousands of its educators and captains of industry and a large majority of its citizens, attest that the Celtic races have borne a large, if not the largest, part in making and preserving the nation, and are entitled to a voice in deciding its destiny.

.

No Dependence on a Monarchy.

That, standing as we do on the soil hallowed by the Celtic blood that ran through the bulwark of that revolution, "the Pennsylvania line," to celebrate to-morrow, in this birthplace of the nation and home of "The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick," the equally heroic, though unsuccessful, attempt of the United Irishmen to establish in Ireland political independence and civil and religious liberty, we say to our American fellow citizens that the future greatness of this Republic and its success in breaking the fetters of the oppressed are not to be attained by dependence upon the professed friendship of an imperiled European monarchy, nor by the introduction here of silly and insulting Old World race prejudices and dissensions, but by our own self-reliance, mutual respect and fidelity to the faith of the founders, as bequeathed in the farewell address of him who was "first in war; first in peace," and ever should be "first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the daily newspapers and THE AMERICAN, of Philadelphia, to the Irish-American newspapers throughout the country, to the President and every member of the Cabinet and Congress of the United States.

PEOPLES PARTY DOINGS.

FROM the daily press Populists can gather little information of the doings of their co-workers in the cause of reform, and that little cut and edited and biased. Of the struggles of Populists in different states to free themselves from the meshes of the Democratic net thrown over them in 1896, which well nigh engulfed the Peoples party, destroyed its identity and stifled the growth of the cause of reform; of their efforts to rescue the Peoples party, not only of their own states but of the country and build up a great party of liberty and equality to which earnest men who have suffered much from the aggressions of the moneyed oligarchy and have feared for the future of our country as a republic dedicated to the cause of true democracy, of human liberty and progress, can look with comfort and hope; of their forward movements for the rejuvenation of the Peoples party, of their meetings and conventions the Populists in other states are kept in profound darkness so far as it is in the power of the great news-distributing agencies, and thus Populists deprived of the strength that encouragement, knowledge of the growth of their party, of Populists working in different parts of the country with not despair but hopefulness of the future, must impart.

To give this news would help the Peoples party, stimulate its growth. Therefore by the papers that profess to be newspapers, but that have monopolistic and old party leanings it is not given. This makes it important that other papers whose office is not the gathering and distributing of news, but that essay to comment on current events and leave their impress on public thought, papers without the news-gathering facilities of newspapers or the means to buy such facilities, to fill this place. To help fill this place that should be filled by the newspaper press, but is not, we purpose to devote a weekly column or two to "Peoples Party Doings," make an effort to give a brief synopsis of the work of Populist conventions and the doings of Populists generally, so that our readers may keep in touch with the growth of that party. Such column will not be filled with

telegraphic news, we must await upon the mails and our exchanges, but the happenings and movements that we shall chronicle will be none the less news to those who look in the daily press and in vain for intelligible and truthful reports of important events concerning the Peoples party.

If our Populist readers, of whom we count many in all states of the Union, will furnish us with brief reports of conventions and the doings of the Populists of their respective states we can in a short time make this chronicle of "Peoples Party Doings" fairly complete.

.

Illinois Populists Down Fusion.

IT IS with an apology that we let the above heading stand, for gentlemen who attend Peoples party conventions, vote for fusion and work to promote the success of some other party can scarcely be classed as Populists. In a Populist convention a fusionist has no more place than has a Republican in a Democratic convention. And so decided Illinois Populists. A few years ago Dr. Howard S. Taylor was one of the foremost of Illinois Populists. But in 1896 and again a year ago and last spring he did all in his power to make the Populists believe that their mission was to strengthen the Democratic party. To this end he worked to bring about fusion. Under the new Illinois election law the name of a candidate cannot be printed on the official ballot more than once. It cannot be printed in the Democratic column and also in a Peoples party column. Therefore it became necessary for Dr. Taylor and his followers if they would support nominees of Democratic conventions to support them as Democrats. And this Dr. Taylor did not hesitate to do in Chicago in the last elections. He and those believing with him controlled the Chicago City Populist convention and endorsed the Democratic candidates. But there were true Populists in Chicago who were disgusted at this, who held that by taking such a course Dr. Taylor read himself out of the party, ceased to be a Populist and became a Democrat, and these true Populists held a convention and nominated a Populist ticket, a ticket under the name of the Peoples party.

Dr. Taylor, however, though acting with the Democrats wanted also to act as a Populist. So a state convention of the Peoples party of Illinois being duly called to meet in Springfield on May 17th, Dr. Taylor got his followers in Chicago together, held a convention that he called the Peoples party convention, just as if nothing had happened, and sent a delegation to the State Populist Convention. Of course the true Populists of Chicago did likewise, choosing a delegation, and the State Committee, by a vote of 34 to 13, put this delegation on the rolls of the convention, declaring that men who acted as Populists were the men entitled to representation in Populist conventions, not the men who voted with Democrats and worked for the success of the Democratic party and not the advancement of the Peoples. No fault was found with Dr. Taylor for working with the Democrats. If the Democratic party stood for his principles it was right for him to do so. But they did find fault with him for assuming the right to speak as a Populist when voting as a Democrat. And they did not propose to accord him that right in a Populist convention.

From the decision of the State Committee the Doctor appealed to the convention on Tuesday, May 17th, but it was of no avail. And then like our Dr. Taylor when he found he could not take the Peoples party of Pennsylvania to the support of Dr. Swallow, an estimable gentleman, but not a Populist, took himself outside of the party. "The doctor's following," writes Mr. Ferriss, of Illinois, in describing the scene "yelled as only men in grief and affliction can yell, but the old time Populists not afraid of noise sat good naturedly in their seats patiently a few minutes and the parting scene was over."

The convention, at which about 300 delegates were present, then proceeded to the work at hand, adopting a ringing platform, nominating a full state ticket, filling the place on the National Committee of Mr. H. A. Taubeneck who had removed from the state and substituting a true Populist on the National Committee in place of Mr. Eugene Smith, of Chicago, who working for Democratic success was no longer a true representative of the Peoples party of Illinois. The two men chosen by the convention as National Committeemen in place of Mr. Taubeneck removed from the state and Mr. Smith recalled are George W. Wickline, of Nashville, and Francis R. Cole, of Chicago. The third Committeeman is Jacob Hess, of Pittsfield, who in recognition of his loyalty to Populism was made Chairman of the Illinois representation on the National Committee.

For State Treasurer the convention nominated William Hess, of Pike; for State Superintendent of Schools, Professor Charles N. Haskins, of Chicago; and for Trustees of the University, Jane Addam, A. C. Vantine and Dr. Minnie Broucher. Charles Palmer, of Noble, Ill., and Joseph A. Hopp, of Ottawa, Ill., respectively chairman and secretary of the State Committee, were re-elected without opposition, "for they have been found to be most excellent men for those positions—true blue, remarkably energetic and sensible."

The convention completed its work by authorizing the State Chairman to call county and district conventions when necessary to fill out local tickets. A resolution favoring a national delegate conference in 1898, and convention for the nomination of a Presidential ticket, February, 1900, was passed, and the State Committee authorized to provide delegates or the manner of selecting them.

Alabama Populists Full of Hope.

THE Peoples party of Alabama is a live force. At Montgomery, on May 3d, the Populists of Alabama, as represented in convention assembled, nominated a full state ticket and chose ten delegates to represent Alabama at the National Convention of the Peoples party that is now certain to meet on July 4th next. At the head of this delegation is Congressman Howard, who enjoys the distinction of being the only Populist in Congress elected without help from the Democrats.

The convention nominated the state ticket amid great enthusiasm, selecting Hon. G. B. Deans, a farmer of Shelby County and an ardent worker in the cause of Populism, as candidate for governor. The platform adopted sets forth that Alabama Populists demand the government ownership of public utilities, the initiative and referendum and imperative mandate, the free coinage of gold and silver at a ratio of 1 to 16, the issue of all other money by the Federal Government without the intervention of banks, the enactment of legislation that will make all money legal tender and prohibit the demonetization by private contract of any money issued by the government and denounce as wholly unnecessary and uncalled for the increase of the bonded debt by borrowing, that which the government has alone the power to create. On state affairs the platform is equally as incisive as it is on national, especially calling for a free vote and fair count and protesting against the efforts of the Democrats to disfranchise men for the crime of being poor.

Of the ticket nominated in Alabama and the prospects of the party Mr. G. B. Crowe, Chairman of the Peoples Party State Committee, writes us as follows:

To Mr. Wharton Barker:

DEAR SIR:—The ticket we nominated last week is one of the cleanest, if not the cleanest Populist ticket that has ever been placed before the people in Alabama, and I feel very hopeful of electing same. Our enemies—the ballot-box stuffers—are very much alarmed over the prospect. Our delegation to the National Convention will go whenever it is called. They are uninstructed and are authorized to cast the full vote for Alabama.

BIRMINGHAM, Ala., May 14th.

G. B. CROWE.

Good Word from the Far South.

FLORIDA Populists are up and doing, resolved to take no steps backward, as will be seen from the following terse letter from the Chairman of the State Committee:

To Mr. Wharton Barker:

DEAR SIR:—We have called a state and Congressional Convention to meet in Ocala, May 31st. We will select straight Middle of the Road delegates to the July 4th. Convention, also all state candidates and three members of the Peoples Party National Committee, fresh from the people and straight goods. You may expect a good account from Florida.

STAUNTON, Fla., May 16th.

F. H. LYTLE.

Chairman Butler's Victory in North Carolina.

SENATOR BUTLER carried the Populist State Convention of North Carolina, which met on Tuesday, May 17th, for fusion with the Democratic party, or, as he chooses to call it, co-operation. Thus he has impressed his desires and received the endorsement of the regularly called Peoples party convention of his own state, but a convention made up in major part of Populists who, though true, were weak-kneed, and in which sat many members ready to advance the fortunes of the Democratic party if they could thereby advance the political interests of some of their leaders. True, Senator Butler, who addressed the conven-

tion, disclaimed with much warmth the charge that he urged Populists to co-operate with Democrats, accept Democratic principles, and give the Democracy supremacy in national affairs in exchange for offices. "I would go down into defeat a thousand times," he exclaimed, "to see the cardinal principles embodied in this resolution (the resolution for co-operation on a basis of free silver) carried into effect. Remember this is not a proposition to dicker for offices, if there is co-operation." Yet he concluded, and mark the words: "Remember, too, that we will get our share of the offices if there is co-operation."

This we take from a report of the convention in Senator Butler's own paper, and we must assume it to be correct. The proposition for co-operation is not a dicker for offices, but if there is co-operation we will get our share of the spoils. Such, in effect, is what Mr. Butler, now Chairman of the National Committee, said.

To such plan of co-operation there was sturdy opposition led by Congressman Skinner who proposed to substitute for the Butler resolutions of co-operation a resolution concluding as follows: "We make no proposition to any party, but invite the co-operation of all parties and citizens who can and do agree with the Peoples party and our state and national principles and problems." But Senator Butler, and for no other apparent reason than that he wanted the doors kept open that the Peoples party might co-operate with a party that does not hold to the principles and problems of the Peoples party, co-operate with a party that is not in accord with it, opposed this substitute resolution and it was defeated by a vote of 675 to 278. At least Senator Butler's paper tells us so. And then under the guide of Senator Butler the convention passed a resolution to appoint a Committee of Conference to confer with any party or organization ready to co-operate on the free silver issue and arrange for a co-operative ticket. Of course the Peoples party convention thus resolving to be dependent on the action of others and not independent had to put off the nomination of a ticket, give that power over to a committee.

Thus has Senator Butler gained a victory. But he cannot afford many such victories. The opposition to fusion was strong, stronger than he had ever met before. As given in Senator Butler's report of the convention one-third of the members of the convention were opposed to his co-operative plan. And after all he gained but a hollow victory. This appears from a letter from a North Carolina correspondent whose name we must withhold but who is a man of unimpeachable character. He writes under date of May 22d:

"Senator Butler is doing all in his power to commit the Populist party of this state to fusion with the Democratic party. After convincing a majority of the late State Convention that he did not in fact mean to co-operate with the Democrats, but only intended to offer co-operation, so as to put them at a disadvantage in case they refused, he had resolutions passed, re-enunciating the principles of the platform and then giving a conference committee the power to make terms with any party that would endorse the said principles. This means an offer of fusion to the Democrats. Their State Convention meets next week, and it is thought they will refuse co-operation with Populists by a large majority. Although the Peoples party Convention passed the resolutions, the very men who voted for them are bitterly opposed to Democratic-Populist co-operation. Butler cannot lead the Populist party of this state, or any large part of it, into the Democratic party. We know that Demo-Populist fusion would mean the absorption and destruction of the Populist organization. If fusion was arranged by the leaders there would be a revolt of the Populist rank and file."

Almost Unanimous for July 4th.

THE referendum vote ordered taken by the National Organization Committee of the Peoples party at its meeting in St. Louis in January last and on the question of date for holding the next National Convention of the Peoples party, which was referred to the rank and file of the party for settlement, has resulted in the district in which Harry Tracy of Texas was appointed by the Referendum Committee to see to the taking of the vote, and as officially reported, as follows:

	July 4, 1898.	May 22, 1899.	February 22, 1900.
Texas,	179,421	19,346	7,297
Arkansas,	19,728	7,469	3,263
Oklahoma,	972	57	62
New Mexico,	326	92	27
Louisiana,	572	29	315
Total	201,019	26,993	10,964

Wanamaker's.

Men's Serge Suits

A WARM day proves the comfort of these lightweight but dressy Serge Suits. We have a special lot ready to-day. The coat is double-breasted with the new Prince Albert lapels, silk-faced to the bottomhole. The fabric is all-wool, pure-dyed blue serge. The price—

fifteen dollars a suit

And there are many other interesting lots of ready-to-wear clothing for men from \$8.50 to \$25. Market street.

Comfortable Clothing to Order

IT'S time to have the comfortable summer suit ready. Every proper sort of lightweight stuff is here, and the liberal Wanamaker facilities for doing prompt and satisfying work. This hint of prices—

Suits made to measure, of homespun, chevots or serges, in blue or black, \$20 to \$25.
Of genuine Clay serges, \$30.
Dressy Suits of Clay weave diagonal coat and vest with trousers 3-4 English stuffs, to order, \$23 a suit.
Suits of 6-4 fancy worsteds, neat checks in dark colors, \$25 to \$30.
Trouserings in excellent assortments, to order, \$6.50 a pair.

City Hall Corner.

JOHN WANAMAKER.

INK



The best, most convenient and cheapest School Ink is **BARBOUR'S TABLET INK**. It cannot freeze, spill or evaporate. You make it as you need it. As a fluid it writes black, does not gum or corrode a pen and is permanent. 5 gal. delivered, \$2.50, 20 gal. delivered, \$9.00. Send 5c in stamps for black, red and purple worth 15c. **BARBOUR'S TABLET INK CO.**, Evansville, Ind.

That CREAMY COMPLEXION

which ladies envy can be secured by every one who will use



MILK-WEED CREAM

No necessity for a bad or rough complexion.

Milk-Weed Cream is the natural Skin Food. It removes Blackheads, Freckles, Tan, Pimples, Wrinkles. Is fragrant and soothing. Send 50c. for a full size jar (if your druggist hasn't it) and get ten times its cost in pleasure and satisfaction. Send stamp for free sample.

FREDERICK F. INGRAM & CO., 49 Tenth Street, DETROIT, MICH.

Progress in Michigan.

FROM Michigan comes this good word from Mr. Zable, member of the National Committee from that state:

To Mr. Wharton Barker.

DEAR SIR: We hold our State Convention at Grand Rapids, June 21st. The Democrats and Fusionists had decided to hold theirs at Detroit, June 29th, but changed to Grand Rapids the 22d. I do not know the reason unless, first, that they have some hopes of pulling us into fusion, or second, to get us to prolong ours, so that if the Fusionists are kicked out by the Democrats it will give them a chance to get under cover by coming back to us. One thing is certain, by doing what they have done they acknowledge that we have the only Populist organization in the state. One of the leading co-operators in "96" has come out with us. We will go ahead with our convention and nominate our ticket and elect delegates to the National Convention to be held July 4th. We have started a new paper which will aid us very much.

PETERSBURGH, Michigan, May 16th.

JOHN O. ZABLE.

Odds and Ends.

At Atlanta, on May 16th, J. R. Hogan was nominated for Governor by the Populists of Georgia, in place of Thos. E. Watson, who refused the nomination tendered him in March last.

THE Reform Press Association is called to meet in Omaha on June 13th. Chairman Butler has called a meeting of the National Committee for the same place two days later, but has given no indication that he will recognize the National Committeemen recently elected by state conventions in place of members no longer holding the confidence of the rank and file of the party. If Chairman Butler thus strives to carry things with a high hand and keep his power by usurpation, there will certainly be an end to the National Committee as a body recognized by the rank and file of the party.

THERE will also meet at Omaha, June 13th, pursuant to call of Chairman Park, of Texas, the National Organization Committee of the Peoples party appointed by the Nashville conference of July 4th a year ago.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Queer Old Folks in Old New England.

In *Old Narragansett*. Romances and Realities. By ALICE MORSE EARLE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 75 cents.

The writer of this, and of other enjoyable books, might doubtless have strung together most learned disquisitions and sparkling talks, literified with the proper display of quotations. Instead of grinding out this sort of thing on the worn-out treadmill Mrs. Earle has betaken herself to the happiest of all womanly tasks with the pen, the telling of stories, real and fanciful, of the good old times in New England. The return to nature is the boon most to be coveted in these days of machine existence. Human nature may be unchanged in essence but it was so much richer before all its corners were filed round. *Narragansett*, R. I., was made the King's Province, with its own government, two hundred and three years ago. Very extensive estates were owned by a small population, African slavery and Church of England religion held equal sway, fine crusted superstitions were cherished, old folk-customs and feasts, witch hunting, voodooism and all the other high-water-marks of seventeenth century civilization gave a picturesqueness to the people and place that has not yet vanished, as these stories show. History, folk-lore and droll adventures mix pleasantly in each, with a genial tone that is very engaging. The description of the hand-loom weavers, who survived until half a century ago, makes excellent reading, a glimpse into a most interesting phase of life which every good American ought to know all about. Another story tells of the "shift-marriages" common to Old and New England. These used to take place at a certain cross-roads, "being in brief the marriage of a woman, usually a widow, clad only in her shift, to avoid hampering her newly made husband with her old debts." The custom prevailed till the beginning of this century. One of the certificates of these legal weddings runs thus: "Thomas Calverwell was joined in marriage to Abigail Calverwell his wife the 22. February 1719-20. He took her in marriage after she had gone four times across the highway in only her shift and hair-lace and no other clothing. Joined together in marriage by me. George Hazard,

NERVOUS PROSTRATION.

A Young Girl at a Critical Period of Life.

In the spring of 1895 my daughter took sick through a cold. First she had mumps and neuralgia; later it went into cramps in her joints. She could not move her arms or legs—could not walk or even feed herself. She had no appetite. Stool and menses were absent and retention of urine; profuse night sweats; trembling in



the right side; pain in the back in the region of the kidneys. At this time she was 15 years old. I wrote you in regard to her and you prescribed Pe-ru-na, which I began to give her at once. Afterward I gave her La-cu-pi-a in connection with Pe-ru-na. I gave her a course of treatment under your free advice, and, besides God, we must thank your medicine for her recovery. We had consulted six or seven doctors and none could help her; on the contrary, she always got worse. When I told the doctor I was going to give her Pe-ru-na he did not think it would help her, because she was on the verge of the grave. But we used Pe-ru-na, and after one bottle she felt as if an electric current went through all her limbs. When we think how low our daughter was we must say it was a great miracle. All that saw my daughter when she was sick can hardly believe it possible. We always keep your medicines in the house and use them for all ailments with success. I cannot recommend Pe-ru-na highly enough. We thank you again.—John Ohlrich, Mifflin, Wis.

The Pe-ru-na Drug Manufacturing Company, Columbus, Ohio, is sending Dr. Hartman's latest book, written especially for women. The book is entitled "Health and Beauty," and every woman, young or old, should have a copy. It is sent free to any address.

It rests with you whether you continue the nerve-killing tobacco habit. **NO-TO-BAC** removes the desire for tobacco, without nervous distress, expels nicotine, purifies the blood, restores lost manhood, makes you strong in health, nerve and pocket-book. **NO-TO-BAC** from your own druggist, who will vouch for us. Take it with a will, patiently, persistently. One box, \$1, usually cures; 3 boxes, \$2.50, guaranteed to cure, or we refund money. Sterling Remedy Co., Chicago, Montreal, New York.

Send for STAMP SELECTION, on approval at 50 per cent. com. Sure to please. \$5 diff. U. S., 25c. 75 diff. \$1, 100 diff. Foreign, 8c. 125 Canada, etc., 15c. Prices List Free! F. W. Miller, 904 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

PLEASE TRY **Cascarets** CANDY CATHARTIC REGULATE THE LIVER All Druggists.

ENDURING ALWAYS

PENN MUTUAL LIFE

INSURANCE COMPANY

The best forms of modern life insurance furnished by members to members at cost. A mutual organization having 60,000 members; assets over \$31,000,000; surplus over \$3,500,000. Address for publications including sample policies. We pay postage.

921-3-5 Chestnut St., Philadelphia

FARMERS!

A NEW WAY TO SELL YOUR GRAIN

H. H. CARR & CO.

Cleveland Bicycles.

Standard for Quality and More Popular than Ever.

A SPLENDID RECORD!

We introduced the . . .

FIRST safety bicycle of standard type.

FIRST bicycle of light weight and narrow tread.

FIRST cross-thread fabric tire. Strong and resilient.

FIRST bicycle chain with hardened block and pin.

FIRST dust-proof, ball-retaining bearing. (Burwell.)

FIRST bicycles with frames built of large tubing.

OUR '98 FEATURES.—Burwell bearings with self-oiling device. Burwell Detachable Tires. On Cleverlands only.

'98 Models. \$50, \$65, \$75.

H. A. LOZIER & CO., Mrs.,

Catalogue free. Cleveland, Ohio.

NEW YORK, BOSTON, PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE, BUFFALO, DETROIT, SAN FRANCISCO, LONDON, PARIS, HAMBURG.

Justice." Occasionally the bridegroom would hand the shivering dame an outfit, announcing that they were not given her, but only lent for this special ceremony. Churches were plentiful, but in winter no warmer than refrigerators. The women took little iron foot-stoves filled with hot coals, and by this means the box pews lost some of their chill. But "the minister often preached two hours and prayed one hour, and some of the Psalms took half an hour to sing," so the pews had ample time to freeze again. All these antique absurdities, sermons, psalms and charcoal footstool fires flourish in Holland to this day. Mrs. Earle gives a graphic sketch of a certain service and the public chastisement of naughty boys for misbehavior. We can hear Deacon Fayerweather as he draws out the psalm for singing, two lines at a time.

O give yee thanks unto the Lord because that good is hee,
Because His loving kindness lasts in perpetuete.

I' th' desert in a desert way they wandered; no towne finde
To dwell in. Hungry and thirsty their Soul within them pinde.

Then did they to Jehovah cry when they were in distresse
Who did them set at liberty,out' of their anguishes.

In such a way as was most right he led them forth also
That to a city which they might inhabit they might go.

The negro stories are as amusing and characteristic as those of the South, with the addition of some real good ghost yarns. Tuggie Bannocks had a grievance against a neighbor who had ruined her copper kettle in repairing it, so she set about working a charm for revenge. First she walked over the snowfields to get certain grass sprigs from his doorstep. She had two full rows of double teeth, front and all were double. She would never sit on stool or chair in anyone's house. She worked for the farmers' wives around the place. The evening of the witchery Tuggie turned her petticoats inside out, and hung a bag of eggshells around her neck to keep off evil spirits. Then she made some dough, mixed in some hairs from a cow's tail, and moulded the dough into the shape of a heart, sticking in two pins for legs and two for arms. Sundry incantations and manoeuvres follow, and then, if the heart is deposited on the doorstep of the person to be bewitched, the charm will work him rheumatism in each limb. It may be news to some that this identical charm, and similar ones, are still in full swing in Europe. Only a few years ago superstitious villagers in England and Ireland perpetrated the cruellest outrages on old women who, as they believed, had bewitched them. Mrs. Earle indulges in a pious lament for those good old times when Narragansett was gay with the music of the clattering loom. "With the passing of these old-time household arts of spinning and weaving went also the household independence. Well timed was our struggle for freedom from British rule, when every man and wife on their own farm held everything necessary for life and comfort—food, shelter, fuel, illumination, clothing. What need had he or she to fear any king? It could not be such an independent revolt to-day; in the matter of clothing alone, no family could be independent of outside assistance." Among the many original characters were the "natural preachers," quaint fellows who felt a real inspiration. One built a rude log pulpit in the woods near his home, and there he would preach and pray so vehemently that distant strollers could hear his rasping tones and the thumps on the book which helped to keep his blood from freezing, for it was winter, and he had no congregation to cheer him up. These delightfully told stories can be read again and again with the certainty of starting one each time on a different track of reflection, and it is good to float back to the old days whether they were better or worse than these.

The Spanish Plot. By F. A. RANDLE. New York: F. Tennyson Neely. 50 cents.

The original title of this strongly written historical narrative seems to have been Idwymon, which word heads each of the book's four hundred pages. The prefatory remarks give no very clear notion of the story, which we hesitate to pronounce fictitious although in the form of fiction. It opens with the two Napoleons, and is concerned chiefly with the Carlist revolt in the fifties. The introduction gives the key to the author's purpose. For a long time England, France and Spain severally tried to lord it over America. The Revolution convinced them that it was a forlorn hope. By the law of the survival of the fittest England remains the strongest member of that triple alliance. "Spain is a monument of greatness and degradation, arrogance

Drexel Biddle's Announcement.

JUST PUBLISHED

TWO IMPORTANT NEW BOOKS.

The Revenge of Lucas Helm.
By AUGUSTE BLONDEL.
With a beautiful frontispiece by Edward Holloway.
This is a story of psychological interest.
The scenes are laid in Nuremberg.
Cloth, 12mo., Gold top, 100 pp. Price, 50 cents.

A Duel with Destiny and Other Stories.
By EDITH TOWNSEND EVERETT.
Illustrated.
Cloth, Gilt top, 12mo., 184 pp. Price, 75 cents.
This volume is bound to attract universal attention, not only on account of the finished style and extraordinary execution of the stories, but also because the author, Mrs. Everett, is recognized as one of the foremost women journalists in America.

For sale by all booksellers, or sent postage prepaid on receipt of the price.

DREXEL BIDDLE, Publisher,
Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

PLEASE TRY

Cascarets

CANDY CATHARTIC

REGULATE THE LIVER

10c. 25c. 50c.

All Druggists, etc.

Polynice

Oil

CURES

RHEUMATISM

Lumbago, Neuralgia, Dyspepsia, and Kindred Diseases.

This new French medical discovery has been used with remarkable success in Bellevue Hospital, New York; Howard Hospital, Philadelphia; Maryland and Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; and in various other hospitals in the prominent cities.

What a Physician Says:
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, Baltimore, 6th April, 1897.
The experiments made here at the hospital with the Polynice Oil, witnessed by me, having been very successful, I hereby recommend it in all cases of rheumatism.
(Signed) DR. F. L. ROGER.

POLYNICE OIL
Imported from Paris, 50 cents per bottle. Sent on receipt of price.
Dr. Alexandre, specialist of Paris, 1218 G Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

PLEASE TRY

Cascarets

CANDY CATHARTIC

REGULATE THE LIVER

10c. 25c. 50c.

All Druggists, etc.

OUR \$1 Silver Dollar Fountain Pen \$1 Mailed on receipt of price

Gold 14K Gold Pen.

The GEO. S. PARKER FOUNTAIN PEN \$2 and upward. Siphon feed saves ink fingers. Of dealers, or mailed prepaid. Beautiful catalogue on request.

The Parker Pen Co., 70 Mill Street, Jansenville, Wis.

and humility. An ascendancy from petty Iberia in far-away times of powerful Greece up to more exalted Hispania under glorious Roman rule up through the splendors of Caliph opulence and the extension of domain, from discoveries by Columbus, by Cortes and Pizarro, and the magnificent Empire of Charles V.; and, also, retrogression reaching the extremes of decadence, an unparalleled impoverishment." The book is good in make-up and will prove as useful as entertaining to many whose interest in Spain is of recent growth.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

- A HISTORY OF ITALIAN LITERATURE. By Richard Garnett, LL.D. Pp. 431. New York: D. Appleton & Co. \$1.50.
- A DUEL WITH DESTINY, and Other Stories. By Edith Townsend Everett. Pp. 162. Philadelphia: Drexel Biddle. 75 cents.
- THE REVENGE OF LUCAS HELM. By Auguste Blondel. Pp. 76. Philadelphia: Drexel Biddle. 50 cents.
- SHANTYTOWN SKETCHES. By A. J. Drexel Biddle. Illustrated by Clarence Snyder. Pp. 67. Philadelphia: Drexel Biddle. 25 cents.
- WORD FOR WORD AND LETTER FOR LETTER. A Biographical Romance. By A. J. Drexel Biddle. Illustrated by Edward Holloway. Pp. 207. Philadelphia: Drexel Biddle. 75 cents.
- MONEY, BANKS, PANICS AND PROSPERITY. By W. H. Clagett. Pp. 147. 456 Louisiana ave., Washington, D. C.: Charles W. Clagett. 25 cents.
- CHRIST IN THE DAILY MEAL; or the Ordinance of the Breaking of Bread. By Norman Fox, D.D. Pp. 138. New York: Fords, Howard and Hulbert. 50 cents.
- THE JOURNAL OF JACOB FOWLER. 1821-22. Edited, with notes, by Elliott Coues. Pp. 183. New York: Francis P. Harper. \$3.00.
- DIE FREIHERREN VON GEMPERLEIN UND KRAMBAMBULI. Edited by A. R. HOHLFELD. Pp. 128. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 30 cents.
- LE ROI DES MONTAGNES. By Edmund About, with introduction and notes by Thomas Logie, Ph.D. Pp. 234. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 40 cents.
- EVOLUTIONARY POLITICS. Addresses and Essays. By Walter Thomas Mills. Pp. 255. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. 25 cents.
- THE SECRET OF THE ROTHSCHILDS. By Mary E. Hobart. Pp. 89. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. 10 cents.

- GOLD OR SILVER? A Political Economy. By Marcus A. Miller. Pp. 207. New York: F. Tennyson Neely. 25 cents.
- NEELY'S PANORAMA OF CUBA. Containing 32 photograph pictures. New York: F. Tennyson Neely. 10 cents.
- THE RISE AND FALL OF THE UNITED STATES. A Leaf from History, A. D. 2060. By A. Diplomat. Pp. 205. New York: F. Tennyson Neely. 25 cents.
- THE SPANISH PLOT. By Frederick A. RANDLE. Pp. 412. New York: F. Tennyson Neely. 50 cents.

\$50 More than Double **\$40**
the number of agencies
placed since January 1
than in the correspond-
ing time in 1897,

AND WHY? Because the popular list
we have placed on the

"Imperial Wheels"
REGISTERED TRADE MARK. —the go-lightly kind.

for 1898, together with the superior quality of the machines and
their general reputation, makes them the leaders of the year.

Special Inducements to Riders. Write for Terms and Discounts.

AMES & FROST CO., Makers, CHICAGO, ILL.

ALL ROADS ARE ALIKE TO A MONARCH.
Perfection is the result of our long
experience.



MONARCH AND DEFIANCE BICYCLES

are the product of mechanical ingenuity.

\$40.00 \$50.00 \$60.00

Monarch Chainless \$100.00

Send for 1898 Catalogue.

Agents wanted in open territory.

MONARCH CYCLE MFG. CO.,

Lake, Halsted and Fulton Streets, Chicago.

Branches—New York, London and Hamburg.

Send ten 2-cent stamps for a deck of Monarch Playing Cards illustrating
Lillian Russell, Tom Cooper, Lee Richardson and Walter Jones.



OUR GRAND OFFER \$1.00
To keep our great factory
busy, and introduce early our splen-
did '98 models we have concluded to
make a marvelous offer direct to the rider.
For 30 days we will sell samples of our
swell '98 bicycles at **net cost to manufac-**
ture and will ship, C. O. D. on approval
to any address on receipt of the nominal
sum of \$1.00 (if west of Denver, \$5). This
deposit is merely to show good faith on purchaser's
part; if you don't want to send money in advance, send
your express agent's guaranty for charges one way and
we will pay them the other if you don't want the wheel.

SIBERIAN. Highest grade, embodying every late improve-
ment of value, 1 1/4 inch imported tubing, flash
joints, improved two-piece cranks, arch crown, large detachable
sprockets, handsomest finish and decorations, Morgan & Wright,
quick repair tires, single or double tube, high grade equip-
ment. Special price on sample..... **\$29.00.**

COSSACK. A splendid machine, equal to any for service and easy running. Best 1 1/4 inch
seamless tubing, two piece cranks, arch crown, detachable sprockets, finely
finished and decorated, Morgan & Wright, quick repair tires, single or double tube,
high grade equipment. Our special sample price..... **\$24.00.**

KLONDIKE. Best medium grade for 1898. 1 1/4 inch tubing, striped and decorated, arch
crown, dust-proof bearings, ball retainers, best Indiana or New Brunswick tires, standard equipment. Special price on sample..... **\$19.00.**

NOTE. Choice of Color, Style, Height of Frame, Gear, etc. Fully Guaranteed.

You will be surprised at the appearance and quality of these wheels. Don't wait, order
now while this offer is open. Prices will be much higher soon. You can make Big Money
as our Agent, selling for us. We give our agents choice of cash, the free use of a sample
wheel, or gift of a wheel, according to work done.

Do You Want Cheap Wheels?

We have numbers of 1896 and 1897 model wheels of various makes and
styles, some a little shop-worn, but all new..... **\$12.00 to \$16.00.**

Wheels Slightly Used, Modern Types, - - **\$8.00 to \$12.00.**

Our business and reputation are known throughout the country. References, any of the
express companies, or any bank in Chicago. Art Catalogue free. Secure agency at once.

The J. L. Mead Cycle Co., - Chicago.